DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 463 586 EA 031 601

AUTHOR Jackson, Jerlando F. L.; Peterson, Kent D.
TITLE Executive Behavior: An Examination of Three Decades of Administrative Work across Organizational Settings, Industries, and Contexts.
PUB DATE 2001-11-00
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Cincinnati, OH, November 2-4, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Behavior; Administrator Characteristics; *Comparative Analysis; Elementary Secondary Education; Work Environment

ABSTRACT

This study examined the executive behavior of educational administrators in schools and universities, and compared it with that of business executives. Data were obtained by tabular review of four select studies on patterns of behavior. Analytical results point to considerable similarity in the daily work realities of executives studied, in spite of differences in organizations and goals. However, when differences did emerge, they were largely due to the executive's proximity to the operational core. Executives closer to the operational core were less likely to have flexibility and control over their work than executives who had layers embedded in their organizations to shield them from the intensity of the operational core. Those closer to the operational core all faced fast-paced days that are commonly fragmented by interruptions and intense to the point that time was not scheduled for non-work-related activities, such as breaks and time for reflection. An implication from this analysis is the need to develop an understanding of how the executive's relative proximity to the core can affect the nature of his or her work. It is hoped that this study will help administrators develop an operational framework for enhancing their work. (Contains 31 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Running head: EXECUTIVE BEHAVIOR

ED 463 586

Executive Behavior: An Examination of Three Decades of Administrative Work Across Organizational Settings, Industries, and Contexts

Jerlando F. L. Jackson

Assistant Professor of Higher and Postsecondary Education

and

Kent D. Peterson

Professor

Department of Educational Administration

University of Wisconsin-Madison

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Jackson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Authors' Note. Presented at the Annual Convention of University Council for Educational Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 2-4, 2001.

EA 031601

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study examines administrative work in business, schools, and universities, by using tabular review to compare the findings of select studies on patterns of behavior. Results of analysis show in spite of differences in organizations and goals, there is considerable similarity in the daily work realities of executives studied. However, when differences did emerge, they were largely due to the executive's proximity to the operational core. Executives who are closer to the operational core, were less likely to have flexibility and control over their work, than executives who had layers embedded in their organization to shield them from the intensity of the operational core.

Executive Behavior: An Examination of Three Decades of Administrative Work Across Organizational Settings, Industries, and Contexts

Administrative work has been a key area of research for decades, since the 1950s researchers have been attempting to understand and describe the work performed by administrators (Burns, 1954; Carlson, 1951; Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001; Dubin & Spray, 1964; Horne & Lupton, 1965; Stewart, 1967; Zaccarro & Klimoski, 2001). This line of inquiry was initiated in the business sector and later explored in other organizational settings. However, one limitation of the literature on administrative work is that data were often gathered exclusively in one organizational setting, industry, or context. Little effort has been expended to explore the landscape of administrative work across these domains. This paper examined administrative work in business, schools, and universities. In the context of this paper, executive behavior is the ways in which executives behave or act, their conduct and decorum.

Early studies of executive behavioral work offered descriptions of the work performed, so that incumbents and future incumbents would have a knowledge base to use in their daily activities (Carlson, 1951; Mintzberg, 1973). Executive work has become increasingly complex, particularly since the 1950s (Charan, Drotter, & Noel, 2001; Zaccarro & Klimoski, 2001). Clearly, it is time to establish "relationships between leadership practice" with the business sector and within the broader field of educational administration. The objective of this paper was to examine the executive behavior of educational administrators in schools and universities and compare it with the executive behavior of business executives. Specifically, this paper compared findings as it relates to

patterns of behavior for the following studies: Mintzberg (1973); Peterson (1978); Helgesen (1990); and Jackson (2000).

Educational Administration and Executive Behavior

Selected research that focused on the behavior of administrators in educational administration (i.e., academic deans and principals) appropriately defines the context for this paper. The goal was to situate educational administrators in the larger study of executive behavior. First, relevant literature for each position was discussed independently. Second, the results of both reviews were synthesized.

Academic Deans

The academic deanship is a unique position within the university, it has been called the "first among equals" and the "lynch pin" for university administration (Bright & Richards, 2001; Martin, Samuels, Associates, 1997; Wolverton, Gmelch, Montez, & Nies, 2001). Equally as unique are the people who fill the position and the administrative behavior required of them. The work demands on deans are bifurcated in nature: (1) they carry out the mission of the administration; and (2) champion the beliefs and values of their faculty (Dibden, 1968; Dill, 1980; Martin & Samels, 1997). The work of deans is extremely complex, for example, one study suggested that deans should be participant observers while performing their daily activities (Bernier, 1987). "The role of a dean requires ethnographic skills in monitoring organizational realities such as changing symbolic systems, managing cultural conflicts, and dealing with conflicting expectations generated by organizational and professional affiliation" (Bernier, 1987, p. 17).

In order to manage their work, deans have been advised to use participatory observational tactics examining the demands of their everyday work situation as opportunities for critical reflection while providing leadership (Ehrlich, 1997). The ability

to survey the landscape of both their school and university helps deans to provide broad based management. Furthermore, reflecting on the challenges of the workday is important as it relates to self-appraisal of one's work (Bowen, 1995; Newsome, 1997).

Deans are encouraged to be collaborative leaders who cultivate input and harmony within the college, university, and professional organizations (Gieger, 1989). Similarly, McCarthy and Reyes (1987) believe that an academic dean's ability to guide a college effectively seems to be enhanced with the use of a collegial model. The collegial model emphasizes shared power, consensus, common commitments and aspirations, by promoting leadership through consultation and collective responsibilities (Birnbaum, 1988). Although not an extensive review, this cursory review provides insights into the challenges of administrative behavior for academic deans.

Principals

Principals are the primary administrator for most schools. They are key to managing resources, developing and evaluating staff, coordinating curricular programs, leading and managing change and improvement, interacting with parents and community, and shaping the school culture (Deal & Peterson, 1994). The role of principals has remained central to establishing and maintaining effective schooling. An important finding emerging from recent research and study of the role of principals is that the basic daily realities of principals' work appear to have not significantly changed in spite of new approaches to teaching, learning, and governance (Peterson, 1998). This appears to be the case in whatever school they lead: urban, suburban, small-town, or rural. These daily realities have not disappeared as principals incorporated new approaches, new structures, and new challenges. Good principals must find ways to lead in the constant welter of activities, problems, and interactions that fill their days (Deal & Peterson, 1998).

Like academic deans, the work of principals is challenging and complex. Many principals employ participatory management approaches, supporting and nurturing teacher leaders. Additionally, they seek to build school cultures into "professional communities" where there is a shared mission, vision and values, ongoing collective inquiry, collaborative teams, action orientation and experimentation, continuous improvement, a results orientation and collective responsibility for student learning (DuFour, 1998; Lambert, 1998). Principals work both internally (in the school and the district), and externally with parents and the community. Like deans, principals face a flurry of problems on a daily basis and cannot defer or ignore them.

In this paper we examined the daily work tasks of educational administrators as compared with managers in other types of organizations and at different levels. What are these daily realities? Educational administrators like other managers face work lives that are characterized by brevity, variety, and fragmentation (Deal & Peterson, 1994; Mintzberg, 1973; Peterson, 1978). Good educational administrators learn to blend leading and managing in the daily flow of intense activity (Deal & Peterson, 1994).

Conceptual Framework and Methodology

This paper examined administrative work from two major sociological perspectives. First, we applied one aspect of role theory to the cross sector analysis of administrative work. Second, we examined variation in the work of administrators from an organizational perspective. This paper re-examined data collected in four studies on the nature of the work performed by corporate chief executive officers, university academic deans, and school principals. The focus of this paper was the commonalities and differences in the patterns of behavior enacted by business and educational administrators. This paper used concepts of role theory and tabular review to perform an

analysis of the patterns of behavior exhibited by educational administrators (Jackson, 2000; Peterson, 1978) and their business executive counterparts (Helgesen, 1990; Mintzberg, 1973).

Role theory is an approach concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristics of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors (Biddle & Thomas, 1966; Biddle, 1979). More specifically, roles in the context of this paper are based on two propositions: (1) some behaviors are patterned and are characteristic of persons within contexts (i.e., roles); and (2) roles are often associated with sets of persons who share a common identity (i.e., social position) (Biddle, 1979; Merton, 1957; Sarbin, 1954; Turner & Colomy, 1988; Turner, 1962). There are many aspects of role theory; in this paper we are comparing behaviors of four different organizational roles. The second form of analysis employed in this paper is that of tabular review (Dooley, 2001). Tabular review is appropriate as a holistic method for analyzing and summarizing the results from numerous studies. "Each line of such a table describes one study with data about its findings and selected aspects of design, such as type and number of subjects" (Dooley, 2001, p. 275). In this analysis, tabular review was applied to the comparison of six common patterns of behavior observed for four replicates of studies on executive behavior selected from three sectors (i.e., business, schools, and universities).

Data

A brief summary of each study used to perform the tabular review is provided in this section. Studies by Mintzberg (1973) and Helgesen (1990) formed the foundation for comparison with educational administrators. In his classic study, Mintzberg (1973) conducted a structured observational study of five male executives (four chief executive

officers and one school superintendent). He employed structured and "anecdotal" (unstructured) data. The structured data consisted of: chronology, mail, and contact records. The chronology record was designed to provide basic data on the design of the workday, and to provide a reference to the other two records. The mail record detailed the nature of the mail received and generated by the executives. The contact record provides detail on meetings, telephone calls, and tours. The anecdotal data were field notes data that helped to facilitate coding, development of theory, and provided examples to support the choices of categories.

As a result of his analysis, Mintzberg identified eight common patterns of behavior exhibited by these executives. These common patterns included: (1) they worked at an unrelenting pace, with no breaks in activity during the day; (2) their days were characterized by interruption, discontinuity, and fragmentation; (3) they spared little time for activities not directly related to their work; (4) they exhibited a preference for live action encounters; (5) they maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside their organizations; (6) because they were immersed in the day-to-day need to keep the organization going, they lack time for reflection; (7) they identified themselves with their jobs; and (8) they had difficulty sharing information. The first six will be used for this paper.

Almost two decades later, Helgesen (1990) replicated Mintzberg's study by examining four female chief executive officers in business. Several differences in these studies must be noted. Helgesen did not attempt to delineate executive roles, as did Mintzberg. While Mintzberg presented his findings in the forms of records: chronology, mail, and contacts; Helgesen opted to present each executive as a narrative, written descriptively. However, Helgesen did generate patterns of behavior in response to

Mintzberg's set. A third study by Jackson (2000) used similar methodology focused on academic deans. This study gathered data to develop: (1) an understanding of the daily administrative processes (activities) of the college of education deans; and (2) a model of executive behavior based on the roles of the dean during the workday. Two male and two female deans were the focus of this study. Mintzberg's methodological approach was employed to collect data with some modifications. The only record employed in this study was the chronology record. The researcher believed that collecting data with the two other records would impede the workday of the academic deans and ultimately the study.

A final study examined the work of school principals using a similar analysis for patterns of activities and time-use (Peterson, 1978). Data were collected through direct observation of two principals' work lives and analyzed descriptively. This study provided a rich description of the work of principals and the roles they performed. The findings of this study were supported in follow-up inquiries (Manasse, 1985). While few contemporary studies have been conducted, these early studies still provide a picture of the behaviors of principals' work and are consistent with many contemporary descriptions.

Similarities and Differences in Patterns of Behavior

The following section identifies patterns of behavior of educational administrators compared to business administrators. The comparison provides additional insight into which patterns of behavior are generic to administration, regardless of sector of employment, and which ones are unique and specific to education and business. Thus providing a better understanding relative to what extent is leadership embedded in

context. Six patterns of behavior in these four organizational positions are compared across these four studies, a brief description and explanation is provided (see Table 1).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

Pace

The pace of managerial work is quite intense. The depiction of the work performed by male executives suggests that this set of executives worked continuously throughout the day without any breaks (Mintzberg, 1973). Helgesen (1990) observed that her female executives performed a large volume of work as well, but metered their pace by scheduling breaks during the workday. While university executives were able to slow their work pace, it was done using unscheduled breaks mostly for providing nourishment and relief for their bodies (Jackson, 2000). Likewise, the school executives observed took few breaks during the workday in order to manage their pace (Peterson, 1978). While the work for all of the executives were performed at an unrelenting pace, the female business executives and university executives attempted to exercise some control over their pace by infusing breaks within the workday. The female business executives actually scheduled these breaks as a part of their work, and school and university executives took small breaks when time was available.

Fragmentation

The discussion of fragmentation looked at two elements: (1) actual fragmentation of the workday; and (2) whether the executives perceived it as part of their job. Fragmentation comes from every direction for executives: staff needs, questions, unexpected (or expected) conflicts, demands, and impromptu problems. Leading and managing organizations must go on while being interrupted, jumping to solve other problems, and attending to unexpected duties. These interruptions do not go away; they

are part of the fabric of these organizations. Fragmentation of the workday is a confirmed pattern of behavior across all studies of executives used for this paper, all were regularly interrupted. Differences occurred when considering whether the executives view fragmentation as part of the job. The male executives felt that the constant interruptions and fragmentation of activities were impediments embedded in the job that negatively affected their work (Mintzberg, 1973). School executives seemed to share the same sentiments as the male executives (Peterson, 1978). The group of female business executives concurred that the work is fragmented and discontinuous, but they did not view the unscheduled encounters and tasks as interruptions (Helgesen, 1990). In contrast, university executives viewed the interruption, discontinuity, and fragmentation as part of their jobs (Jackson, 2000).

Personal Tasks

As with other professionals, these executives spared little time addressing personal tasks while working. The male and school executives concentrated on work related activities during the workday, sparingly receiving or placing phone calls personal in nature (Mintzberg, 1973; Peterson, 1978). While, the female business and university executives consciously made efforts to incorporate non-business related activities during the day (Helgesen, 1990; Jackson, 2000). There are two possible reasons for this contrast. First, the latter executives spent a significant portion of their time in the evenings and weekends performing business related activities. Therefore, for these executives the line between personal and professional life was blurred. So just as they needed to perform professional activities at home, they also needed to perform personal activities in the office in order to manage and balance their lives. Second, contemporary executives are

constantly being advised to be conscious of stress and health issues related to their job. This suggestion may have developed into programs that include breaks during the workday and infused time that does not relate to work to help minimize the possibility of being negatively affected by stress and health issues.

Preference of Interactions

The findings on preference of interactions had two elements: (1) preference for interactions; and (2) individual assumptions about work. There was a pattern across executives suggesting that live action encounters were preferred. Included in the discussion on preference of interaction was the handling of mail. Mintzberg (1973) observed from his male business executives that they viewed mail management as meticulous, time-consuming, and a nuisance. Counter to this assumption about work, Helgesen (1990) found her female business executives simply scheduled time to manage mail. Jackson's (2000) university executives also schedule time to attend to mail, but with the advancements of technology, they increasingly used electronic mail as a form of interaction. Peterson's (1978) observations of school executives did not directly collect data regarding preference of interactions, though their pattern of work suggested a similar preference.

Networking

All executives worked in complex systems of management that required them to foster and develop relationships with various constituents. The one area of non-consensus was whether the network was external or internal. Most of the executives maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside of their organization, with the

exception of the school executives that primarily formed and maintained relationship inside the school and district.

Reflection

These executives for the most part spent the majority of their time at work and at home immersed in the daily activities of running their company, school district, college, or school building. Therefore, none of them had time to adequately reflect on the work they had performed. For the most part, they kept activities going, without time to determine if what they did or how they did it was effective or efficient. Helgesen (1990) found her female business executives did not have this problem; they focused on the ecology of leadership. The ecology of leadership: "... encompasses a vision of society - they relate decisions to their larger effect upon the role of the family, the American educational system, the environment, even world peace" (Helgesen, 1990, p. 25).

Conclusion and Implications

The findings from this tabular review of these four studies suggest similarities of time use across organizations not withstanding the for-profit and not-for-profit elements. In spite of differences in organizations and goals, there is considerable similarity in the daily work realities of these executives. The pace, interruption, and preference for live action are similar across these studies. However, they differed in their approach to personal tasks. While we cannot determine exactly why these varied executives were so similar (and occasionally different), let us suggest some insights about these comparisons.

First, executives across the organizations all faced fast paced days. In part, this may be due to the fact that they are not only responsible for their own work, but also the complex work of many subordinates, a large number of whom are either professionals or

other managers. While some executives were able to slow their pace with interventions, it is hypothesized that this flexibility is due to the executive's proximity to the operational core of the organization. The operational core for organizations encompass those members who perform the basic work related directly to the services offered (Mintzberg, 1983; Thompson, 1967). The operational core is the heart of every organization; it is the part that produces the essential outputs that keep it running. It is the direct link to instructional leadership (teacher and classroom teaching). Executives closer to the operational core were less likely to slow their pace. Second, all had highly fragmented work schedules. Dealing with unscheduled events and problems may have occurred because difficulties migrate upward unexpectedly. These unanticipated challenges must be addressed immediately, this transforms planned days into a quilt of fragmented activities.

The difference in personal tasks may be due to the historical context (dates of studies). The studies performed in the 1990s and beyond seemed to emphasize and be more sensitive to personal time and needs. Additionally, the use of time or lack of it for personal tasks may be influenced by the executive's proximity to the operational core as well. Executives closer to the operational core seemed to dedicate their entire time at work making sure that the organization is functioning properly. Overall work demands are more active than passive and may attract those who have a preference for action. Individuals who like to be active will be more inclined to aspire to executive positions. This also may be the same as it relates to reflection. When one shares a passion for live interaction, taking individual time to reflect on their actions may be quite difficult.

Finally, these executives were responsible for the effective functioning of numerous systems and subsystems (e.g., budget, personnel, and planning). These no doubt required extensive connections and networks with other units and individuals. Without this networking, overall system functioning would be compromised. The following are implications for this study.

Operational Core

An implication from this analysis is the need to develop an understanding of the executive's relative proximity to the operational core. Specifically, pace and fragmentation are intensified as the executive is located closer to the operational core. Executives who are in close proximity of the day-to-day operations of the organization, have less flexibility to exercise control over their time use. Therefore, executives who are in close proximity of the operational core should be aware that they would have lower levels of flexibility in their jobs. This will in turn, provide realistic expectations for executives who do not have layers embedded in their organization to shield them from the intensity of the operational core.

Affinity for Live Action

The potentiality of very active individuals being attracted to executive positions has implications for training and selection. How candidates are admitted and trained in principal certification programs may be reconsidered. Programs must infuse methods to help students be adaptive, versatile, and flexible. Additionally, to help individuals with a preference for live interaction take time to provide reflection in practice when considering candidates for program admission and for employment, attention should be placed on identifying high energy incumbents for these positions. Since the training of

academic deans is experiential in nature, attention should be placed on the selection process. Providing an accurate picture of the nature of the work, and the need for a person with high energy will help to lower the "reality shock" for deans as well.

Not Much has Changed

After reviewing 30 years of administrative work across organizational setting, industries, and contexts, we find very little changed in the work behavior of executives. The same complex work demands plague present day executives, as they did earlier executives who had to blaze the way without the many volumes of research presently available. The research available today allows executives to work smarter, but it does not provide methods to escape the "work realities." The aforementioned were implications from the similarities and differences of executives work across organizational setting, industries, and contexts. The implications were predicated on creating knowledge about crosscutting issues of administrative behavior and context specific findings. To the extent that this comparison can help administrators develop an operational framework for enhancing their work, this comparison will have served its purpose as a heuristic tool.

References

Bernier, N. (1987). The dean as participant observer. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 17-22.

Biddle, B. J. (1979). Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Biddle, B. J., & Thomas, E. J. (Eds.). (1966). Role theory: Concepts and research. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bright, D. F., & Richards, M. P. (2001). The academic deanship: Individual careers and institutional roles. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Burns, T. (1954). The directions of activity and communication in a departmental executive group. Human Relations, 7, 73-97.

Carlson, S. (1951). Executive behavior: A study of the work load and the working methods of managing directors. Stockholm: Strombergs.

Charan, R., Drotter, S., & Noel, J. (Eds.). (2001). The leadership pipeline: How to build the leadership-powered company. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1994). Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dooley, D. (2001). Social research methods (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Dublin, R., & Spray, S. L. (1964). Executive behavior and interaction. Industrial Relations, 3, 99-108.

Geiger, J. (1989). Education deans as collaborative leaders. Journal of Teacher Education, 40, 2-4.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Horne, J. H., & Lupton, T. (1965). The work activities of 'middle' managers - an exploratory study. The Journal of Management Studies, 2, 14-33.

Jackson, J. F. L. (2000). Decanal work: Using role theory and the sociology of time to study the executive behavior of college of education deans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Lambert, L. (1998). Building leadership capacity in schools. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Manasse, L. A. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: Policy Implications of research. Elementary School Journal, 85, 138-162.

Martin, J., Samels, J. E., & Associates (1997). First among equals: The role of the chief academic officer. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press.

McCarty, D. J., & Reyes, P. (1987). Organizational models of governance: Academic deans' decision making styles. Journal of Teacher Education, 38, 2-8.

Merton, R. K. (1957). Social theory and social structure. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Peterson, K. D. (1978). The principal's tasks. Administrator's Notebook, 26, 1-4.

Peterson, K. D. (1998). Realities and reform: Living with the daily realities of principals' work. Instructional Leader, 11, 6-8.

Sarbin, T. R. (1954). Role theory. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Stewart, R. (1967). Managers and their jobs. London: Macmillan.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizations in action: Social science bases of administrative theory. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Turner, R. H. (1962). Role-taking process versus conformity. In A. M. Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social processes: An interactionist approach. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Turner, H. R., & Colomy, P. (1988). Role differentiation: Orienting principles. In E. J. Lawler (Ed.), Advances in group processes (Vol. 5). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Wolverton, M., Gmelch, W. H., Montez, J., & Nies, C. T. (2001). The changing nature of the academic deanship. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report Volume 28:1.

Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (Eds.). (2001). The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Table 1. A Comparison of Patterns of Executive Behavior Across Organizational Settings, Industries, and Contexts

	Mintzberg (1973) 5 Male CEOs	Peterson (1978) 2 Male Principals	Helgesen (1990) 4 Female CEOs	Jackson (2000) 4 College of Education Deans 2 Males and 2 Female
Pace	The executives worked at an unrelenting pace, with no breaks in activity during the day.	The principals worked at an unrelenting pace, with few breaks in activity during the day.	The executives worked at a steady pace, but with small breaks scheduled in throughout the day.	The deans worked at a brisk pace, but took small unscheduled breaks throughout the day.
Fragmentation	Their days were characterized by interruption, discontinuity, and fragmentation.	The principals' days were filled with constant interruption and fragmentation.	They did not view unscheduled tasks and encounters as interruptions.	The deans viewed the unscheduled tasks and encounters as part of their job.
Personal Tasks	They spared little time for activities not directly related to their work.	The principals had little time for personal tasks.	They made time for activities not directly related to their work.	The deans made modest efforts to incorporate non-business related activities into their workday.
Preference of Interactions	They exhibited a preference for live action encounters.	The principals had a clear preference for live action.	They preferred live action encounters, but scheduled time to attend to mail.	The deans preferred live action encounters, scheduled time to attend to mail, and increasingly used electronic mail.
Networking	They maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside their organization.	The principals' maintained complex relationships throughout their district.	They maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside their organization.	They maintained a complex network of relationships with people outside their organization.
Reflection	Immersed in the day-to-day need to keep the company going, they lacked time for reflection.	The principals spent little time on reflection.	They focused on the ecology of leadership.	Immersed in the daily activities of the deanship, they lacked time for reflection.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Jerlando F.L.Jackson/Assistant Professor
Organization/Address: University of Wisconsin 1161K Educ. Sciences Building 1025 W. Johnson St.; Madison,WI 53706	Telephone: 608-262-8866 Fax: 608-265-3135 E-mail Address: jjackson@education.wisc.edu Date: 3/12/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Document Acquisitions Department
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207